



## University of Tennessee, Knoxville Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

---

Strategic Planning

Office of the Chancellor

---

6-2011

# Journey to the Top 25

Office of the Chancellor

Follow this and additional works at: [http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_chanstrategic](http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanstrategic)

---

### Recommended Citation

Office of the Chancellor, "Journey to the Top 25" (2011). *Strategic Planning*.  
[http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_chanstrategic/4](http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanstrategic/4)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of the Chancellor at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Strategic Planning by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).



# JOURNEY TO THE TOP

Action Plan – June 2011

# 25

THE UNIVERSITY of  
TENNESSEE **UT**  
KNOXVILLE



# Table of Contents

Background	Page 3
I. Planning Process	Page 6
II. Current Position	Page 14
III. Top 25 Action Plan	Page 28
IV. Major Investments and Resource Needs	Page 41
V. Sources of Funds	Page 50
VI. Implementation and Accountability	Page 54
 <b><u>Appendix</u></b>	
A. Top 25 Current Position Summary	Page 65
B. Supporting Plans	Page 70



## Recent History – Top 25 Challenge

In March of 2010, Chancellor Jimmy Cheek appointed a broad-based “Top 25 Task Force” in response to a challenge from Governor Phil Bredesen to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (“UTK”): *Become a Top 25 public research university*. This group was charged to help meet this challenge; including performing analyses that compared UTK to selected peer universities and recommending key strategies for improvement to set UTK on an aggressive improvement path.

The Top 25 Task Force developed a benchmarking methodology that compares UTK to a peer group, which includes the nation’s best public universities. The resulting gaps served as the basis for development of recommended strategies intended to close those gaps. Chancellor Cheek presented this analysis to the Board of Trustees in June 2010.

Following the meeting of the Trustees, UTK made the Top 25 initiative an institutional priority, and aligned related objectives with VOL Vision, the guiding strategic framework for the University.

# VOL Vision

“VOL Vision 2015: The Pursuit of the Top 25” (“VOL Vision”), was drafted under the leadership of Provost Susan Martin and completed in Fall of 2010.

The VOL Vision priorities below align with the Top 25 metrics, and provide broad strategic direction for the University:

1. **Undergraduate Education** – Recruit, develop, and graduate a diverse body of undergraduate students who through engagement in academic, social, and cultural experiences, embrace the Volunteer Spirit as life-long learners committed to the principles of ethical and professional leadership
2. **Graduate Education** – Educate and graduate increasing numbers of diverse graduate and professional students who are equipped to address the pressing concerns of their fields, to extend the frontiers of knowledge, and to contribute to the public good through service to the academy or their professions
3. **Research** – Strengthen our capacity and productivity in research, scholarship, and creative activity to better educate our students; enhance economic, social, and environmental development; support outreach to our various constituencies; and extend the reputation and recognition of our campus.
4. **Faculty** – Attract and retain stellar, diverse faculty and staff who will proudly represent our campus, execute our mission, embrace our vision, exemplify our values, and collaborate to realize our strategic priorities.
5. **Infrastructure and Resources** – Continually improve the resource base, including attracting and retaining excellent staff, to achieve campus priorities by carefully balancing state revenues, tuition, and private funding, and by embracing stewardship of our campus infrastructure and a culture that values sustainability.

# Action Planning

With *VOL Vision* in place, UTK moved forward with developing specific plans for action and accountability that address implementation, resource allocation, and outcome measures. In August 2010, Chancellor Cheek appointed Dr. Mary Albrecht as Top 25 Leader to guide action planning efforts and track progress. Teams were appointed to address five areas:

- Undergraduate Education, led by Vice Provost Sally McMillan
- Graduate Education, led by Vice Provost and Dean Carolyn Hodges
- Research, led by Interim Vice Chancellor J. Wesley Hines
- Faculty, led by Vice Provost Sarah Gardial
- Infrastructure and Resources, led by Vice Chancellor Chris Cimino
  - Staff Team, led by Mike Herbstritt and Tom Cervone

In September of 2010, the Undergraduate Education team piloted the action planning process. As part of this effort, a consistent approach and methodology was established. In January of 2011, the Graduate Education, Research, Faculty, and Staff planning teams began their efforts.

All individual team planning efforts were completed in May of 2011, and the resulting plans were integrated into this Top 25 Action Plan.



# **I. Planning Process**



# Objectives


The planning process was designed to develop specific action plans and estimate major resource needs to address VOL Vision/Top 25 priorities.

- Address gaps in the five areas of focus: undergraduate education, graduate education, research, faculty and infrastructure/resources
- Use data and analysis to discover opportunities for both immediate and long-term improvement
- Identify the necessary investments needed
- Establish an expectation for accountability, assessment, and continuous improvement
- Surface opportunities for operational effectiveness



# Process


A consistent process was used to develop action plans. This included a review of UTK's current situation and an assessment of best practices in place at Top 25 peer institutions.



# Plan Structure

Each of the five planning teams developed structures to reflect high-level improvement directions, which led to a series of more detailed, supporting action plans.

Illustrative Example



## Action Plan Focus Areas

Improvement directions were identified by teams based on current situation trends, internal study, and comparison to peers

## Supporting Action Plan Profiles

Action plans were developed to outline detailed actions, objectives, resource needs, and accountability metrics

# Role of Action Plan Profiles


Action plans were developed to identify specific near-term actions for improvement, promote communication among stakeholders, and support implementation.

- Action plan profiles include:
  - Rationale and strategic objectives
  - Near-term action steps
  - Resource requirements
  - Implementation considerations
  - Accountability plan
  - Key success metrics for measuring progress
- Plans were used as a method of communicating and gathering feedback:
  - Shared with key stakeholders for early feedback and buy-in
  - Used to clarify resource needs
- Plans were also designed to promote accountability for implementation

# Elements of an Action Plan Profile

Action plan profiles provide a data-driven view of the context, rationale, and resources required for each proposed action.

## Illustrative Example



# Top 25 Action Plan Teams

The planning process engaged over 50 UTK stakeholders, including executives, team members, academic leaders, faculty, staff and students.

Team	Chair	Membership		
<b>Undergraduate Education</b>	Sally McMillan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Melissa Shivers</li> <li>▪ Ruth Darling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Chris Cimino</li> <li>▪ R.J. Hinde</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ John Koontz</li> <li>▪ Richard Bayer</li> </ul>
<b>Graduate Education</b>	Carolyn Hodges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ernest Brothers</li> <li>▪ Yvonne Kilpatrick</li> <li>▪ Maxine Thompson</li> <li>▪ Kay Reed</li> <li>▪ Stefanie Ohnesorg</li> <li>▪ Vince Anfara</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Andrew Morse</li> <li>▪ Tom Ladd</li> <li>▪ Carol McCrehan Parker</li> <li>▪ Masood Parang</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lee Riedinger</li> <li>▪ Cynthia Rocha</li> <li>▪ Jim Brace</li> <li>▪ Jan Lee</li> <li>▪ Scott Wall</li> </ul>
<b>Research</b>	Wes Hines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Greg Reed</li> <li>▪ Ken Stephenson</li> <li>▪ Bill Dunne</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tom Ladd</li> <li>▪ Chris Boake</li> <li>▪ Bob Rider</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Carol Tenopir</li> <li>▪ Bill Brown</li> </ul>
<b>Faculty</b>	Sarah Gardial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Beauvais Lyons</li> <li>▪ Marva Rudolph</li> <li>▪ Carol Harden</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Terry Esper</li> <li>▪ John Zomchick</li> <li>▪ Matthew Theriot</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lynne Parker</li> <li>▪ Brian Wirth</li> </ul>
<b>Staff</b>	Tom Cervone Mike Herbstritt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Debra Douglas</li> <li>▪ Margaret Norris</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Valeria Hodge</li> <li>▪ Roger McDonald</li> <li>▪ Kathy Morgan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Anton Reece</li> <li>▪ Ann Robinson-Craig</li> </ul>
<b>Infrastructure and Resources</b>	Chris Cimino	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Wes Hines</li> <li>▪ Carolyn Hodges</li> <li>▪ Mike Herbstritt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sarah Gardial</li> <li>▪ Sally McMillan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bob Campbell</li> <li>▪ Scott Studham</li> </ul>

# Plan Overview

The plan is supported by 64 action plan profiles, and 6 other continuous actions related to Infrastructure and Resources.

Team	Supporting Action Plan Profiles
Undergraduate Education	24
Graduate Education	12
Research	12
Faculty	8
Staff	8
Infrastructure and Resources	6 Continuous Actions



## **II. Current Position**

# UTK Position: One Year Change

## 2010 vs. 2011 Assessment

Areas of Focus	Indicators	UTK 2010 Assessment	UTK 2011 Assessment	Change
Undergraduate Education	ACT Equivalent (75 <sup>th</sup> /25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile)	29/24	29/24	No Change
	Retention Rate (1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year)	84%	86%	+2 pts
	Six-Year Graduation Rate	60%	61%	+1 pt
Graduate Education	Number of Ph.D. Degrees	277	258	-19
	Number of Master's and Professional Degrees	1,845	1,807	-38
Research	Federal Research Expenditures	\$70 M	\$ 109 M	+\$39 M
	Total Research Expenditures	\$165 M	\$ 197 M	+\$32 M
Faculty	Avg. Tenure-Line Salary Range	\$66 to \$107 K	\$67 to \$109 K	+\$1 to \$2 K
	Undergraduate Students/Tenure-Line Faculty	20	20	No Change
	Faculty Awards	10	11	+1
Infrastructure and Resources	Teaching and Support Expenditures/Student	\$16,100	\$16,300	+\$200
	Endowment/Student	\$14,380	\$16,370	+\$1,990

Sources: UTK institutional data; U.S. News & World Report; The Center for Measuring University Performance; The National Science Foundation; Council for Aid to Education; Institutional Common Data Sets

Notes: (1) Salary data have been updated to remove UTHSC salary data; current data reflect salaries for UTK, UTSI and UTIA; (2) Data year is based on availability of peer data; "2010 Assessment" data are primarily FY08 and "2011 Assessment" data are primarily FY09



# UTK vs. Top 25 Peers

## *Change in Gap*

Areas of Focus	Metrics	UTK vs. Top 25 Target Group 2010 Assessment	UTK vs. Top 25 Target Group 2011 Assessment	Change in Gap
Undergraduate Education	ACT Equivalent (75 <sup>th</sup> /25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile)	+5/.5	+6/.2	<i>UTK Remains Above Peers</i>
	Retention Rate (1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year)	-6 pts	-5 pts	<i>Decreased</i>
	Six-Year Graduation Rate	-15 pts	-15 pts	<i>No Change</i>
Graduate Education	Number of Ph.D. Degrees	-209	-225	<i>Increased</i>
	Number of Master's and Professional Degrees	-285	-433	<i>Increased</i>
Research	Federal Research Expenditures	-\$112 M	-\$83 M	<i>Decreased</i>
	Total Research Expenditures	-\$262 M	-\$254 M	<i>Decreased</i>
Faculty	Avg. Tenure-Line Salary Range	-\$7 to \$13	-\$7 to \$12	<i>Mixed</i>
	Undergraduate Student/Tenure-Line Faculty	+1	+1	<i>No Change</i>
	Faculty Awards	-22	-24	<i>Increased</i>
Financial Resources and Infrastructure	Teaching and Support Expenditures/ Student	-\$8,200	-\$7,410	<i>Decreased</i>
	Endowment/ Student	-\$24,020	-\$25,870	<i>Increased</i>




# Undergraduate Education

## *Current Position*

- UTK remains above the Top 25 Target peers in incoming student quality as measured by ACT score. Based on this measure, UTK's incoming student profile has improved significantly over the last decade.
- Historically, UTK loses more students after the first year than after the second and third years combined. UTK's first-to-second year retention rate has improved, and the gap to the Top 25 Target peers has decreased over a one-year period. However, UTK is still below the Top 25 Target peer average for this metric.
- Six-year graduation rates remain relatively flat, and the year-to-year gap to Top 25 peers is unchanged. However, a recent increase in four-year graduation rates, 5% over the past two years, is a positive indicator for future outcomes.

# Undergraduate Education

*1st to 2nd Year Retention Rate; 2004 to 2009 Freshmen Cohort Years*




**UF**  
86%

Source: UTK Institutional Data

# Undergraduate Education

*Four, Five and Six-Year Graduation Rates; 2000 to 2006 Freshmen Cohort Years*



Source: UTK Institutional Data




# Graduate Education

## *Current Position*

- The total number of graduate degrees awarded has decreased from 2009 to 2010, by approximately 3% overall. Over the same period, the gap between UTK and Top 25 Target peers grew.
- A ten-year view of graduate degree production shows flat performance, and the 2009 to 2010 decrease is consistent with the normal fluctuation.
- Top 25 graduate degrees awarded metrics are not normalized, and many of the Top 25 Target peers are larger than UTK. When normalized by the number of tenure-line instructional faculty, UTK is lower than peers on Ph.D. degree production.
- Progress on graduate degrees awarded will require a long-term, multi-year commitment and new resources. Graduate student enrollment will need to increase in the near term, and there will be a significant lag time before any enrollment increase is reflected in degrees awarded. For example, the average time-to-degree for Ph.D. candidates is over seven years. Ph.D. candidates enrolled next year will not be reflected in the Ph.D. degrees awarded metric for several years.
- While there appears to be some faculty capacity to accommodate a near-term increase in graduate student enrollment, additional faculty lines will be needed to support the enrollment growth needed to close the gap to Top 25 peers.

# Graduate Education

## *Degrees Awarded; 2000 - 2010*



Source: UTK Institutional Data




# Research

## *Current Position*

- UTK demonstrated strong year-over-year growth in research expenditures and has made progress towards closing gaps to Top 25 Target peers. Growth can be attributed in part to winning major federal research grants, development of new centers and joint institutes, and expanded proposal support for faculty.
- Top 25 research expenditure metrics are not normalized, but many of the Top 25 Target peers are larger than UTK, and some have medical schools, which can account for a large portion of research expenditures. When compared to peers with no medical schools and normalized by tenure-line instructional faculty, UTK is ahead of three (Purdue, Clemson, and the University of Georgia).
- To close the gap in federal expenditures, UTK will need additional faculty. Top 25 Target peers with no medical schools have, on average, 40% more tenure-line faculty than UTK.
- Similar to graduate education, progress in research will require a long-term, multi-year commitment and new resources. While there are productivity gains to be made with current resources, maintaining growth in the long run will require additional investments. The amount and quality of research space is an emerging constraint, as well as the number of faculty.

# Research

## *Federal Research Expenditures; UTK vs. Top 25 Peers with No Medical School; 2004 - 2009*



Source: NSF Survey of Science and Engineering Expenditures, 2009; UTK NSF Survey Submission

Note: UTK Data Include: Agricultural Experiment Station, College of Veterinary Medicine, Extension, Knoxville, Space Institute






# Faculty

## *Current Position*

- The one-year change in the number of UTK tenure-line instructional faculty is flat, and the ratio of undergraduate students to tenure-line instructional faculty has not changed.
- UTK average faculty salaries increased slightly from Fall 2009 to Fall 2010, but the large faculty salary gap to Top 25 Target Peers has remained constant. The UTK increase is due primarily to the hiring of Governor's Chairs, the hiring of new assistant professors, and promotional raises. Comparing faculty salaries among Top 25 peers, UTK remains near the bottom. For example, in Assistant Professor salaries, UTK is second from the bottom.
- UTK has made steady gains in faculty awards. Over the past four years, the total number of faculty awards has increased, showing positive momentum for this metric. Top 25 Target peers, though, have also improved on this metric, and the UTK gap to peers increased.

# Faculty

## Average Assistant Professor Salary – UTK vs. Top 25 Peers; Fall 2010



Source: American Association of University Professors




# Infrastructure and Resources

## *Current Position*

- The gap between UTK and Top 25 Target peers in financial resources remains substantial. From a year-over-year perspective, the teaching and support expenditures per student ratio increased. However, this is due to a decrease in total students rather than an increase in expenditures. Total teaching and support expenditures decreased by approximately \$5 million or 1%.
- The UTK increase in endowment per student can be attributed to both market gains and new gifts. However, Top 25 Target peers grew at a greater rate and the year-to-year gap increased.
- From an infrastructure perspective, the amount and quality of space for teaching and research has been identified as a constraint. Compared to standards set by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, UTK is at an approximately 873,000 gross square footage deficit for academic and research space.

# Infrastructure and Resources

*Research and Academic Space Deficits (THEC Standards); Gross Square Footage; 2010*



Source: UTK Institutional Data; Tennessee Higher Education Commission Space Standards



### **III. Top 25 Action Plan**

# Assumptions

## *Plan Scope*


- The plan identifies specific actions to support near-term improvement and demonstrates the scope of existing gaps in major resource areas.
- The plan assumes concurrent progress on implementation of undergraduate education, graduate education, and research plans.
- The plan is designed to make progress in the current, resource-constrained environment, but acknowledges the need for future investment. In each plan, opportunities for operational effectiveness and structures to promote prioritization were incorporated to support strategic use of existing resources.

## *Next Steps*

- The plan recognizes that advancement in the quality and use of data for decision making is a necessary, foundational condition for developing more robust strategies for improvement.
- The plan does not directly address growth in academic and research programs, but assumes that academic and research leaders will be engaged in next steps to identify opportunities for strategic growth and advancement.
- The plan acknowledges that, on average, UTK has fewer faculty than Top 25 Target peers. This is a constraint to achieving the growth needed to close gaps to these Top 25 Target peers, particularly in research and graduate education. The plan further assumes that any future increase in the number of faculty will align with a strategic approach to growth and advancement.

# Plan Structure

The action plans set priorities in undergraduate education, graduate education, and research to guide prioritization and future investment.



# Plan Priorities

Priorities guide both near-term improvement efforts and future planning for more transformational opportunities.

- The **undergraduate education** plan focuses on improving graduation and retention rates by addressing current constraints, improving operational effectiveness and student support, developing new programs, and revising policies.
- The **graduate education** plan develops a platform for future growth by improving recruitment, student financial support, and operational effectiveness to support an increase in enrollments.
- The **research** plan focuses on strengthening the foundation for strategic growth by developing and continuing to develop the necessary infrastructure, support, and processes.
- The **faculty** plan addresses current gaps in faculty salary and benefits, while improving faculty professional development, support, and satisfaction.
- The **infrastructure and resources** structure aligns the priorities identified in the other four areas with available resources (space, technology and staff) and develops strategies for identifying future sources of funds.

**Appendix B includes an overview supporting plans and actions. Full supporting plans for Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education, Research and Faculty include additional context, structure, and detail.**



# Undergraduate Education Priorities

## FOUNDATION

### *Elevate Quality and Use of Undergraduate Student Data*

Improve availability, reliability and use of data to support decision making

1

### *Expect Graduation in Four Years*

Expect students to graduate in four years, structure clear paths to completion, revise constraining policies, and provide courses when they are needed

2

### *Provide Adequate Core Student Support*

Improve service levels to students; hire additional staff in areas that provide critical student support, but are currently understaffed

3

### *Support Transition into the First Year*

Expand effective programs targeted at freshmen to reduce the number of students lost after the first year

4

### *Engage Students Based on Changing Profile*

Develop new programs to better meet the needs of today's UTK student

# Graduate Education Priorities

## FOUNDATION

### *Elevate Quality and Use of Graduate Student Data*

Improve availability, reliability and use of data to track graduate student progress and success and to support decision making

1

### *Increase Graduate Student Financial Support*

Increase the number and amount of graduate student stipends, available tuition/fee waivers, and fellowships awarded to improve recruitment outcomes and enhance the graduate student academic experience

2

### *Improve Graduate Student Admissions and Recruitment*

Employ effective recruitment, marketing, and admissions strategies to increase the number, diversity, and quality of incoming graduate students

3

### *Expand Services for Graduate Student Engagement and Success*

Provide additional and enhanced advising and mentoring, professional development, and leadership initiatives to reduce student time to degree, increase post-graduate placement success, and foster community and civic engagement

4

### *Maximize Degree Offerings Through Academic Collaboration*

Enhance interdisciplinary and dual and joint degree program offerings to provide students with additional opportunities for career choices and success

# Research Priorities

## FOUNDATION

1

### ***Research Strategies and Supporting Infrastructure***

Provide the campus space, strategy, and infrastructure necessary to support a Top 25 research program

2

### ***Policies and Practices to Enhance Research Growth and Success***

Enhance and expand the research services necessary to enable our faculty to be successful

3

### ***Research Recognition and Rewards***

Incentivize and reward research success across all disciplines

4

### ***Research Communication and Engagement***

Communicate with stakeholders and provide opportunities for researchers to engage potential funding agencies, corporations, and foundations

5

### ***Intellectual Property and Economic Growth***

Increase the conversion of intellectual property generated through research into patents, economic growth, institutional revenues, and business startups

# Faculty Priorities

## FOUNDATION

### *Elevate Quality and Use of Faculty Data*

Improve availability, reliability, and use of data to support reporting to external agencies, evaluating and rewarding faculty, allocating resources across units, and assessing unit performance relative to Top 25 benchmarks

1

### *Close Salary Gap with Top 25 Peers*

Create a strategy to close the salary gap with peers through a combination of raises and increasing the number of privately funded professorships and chairs

2

### *Enable Faculty Productivity*

Continue to improve the workload, campus support and communication to enable faculty productivity and pursue national/international external awards

3

### *Focus on Faculty Retention*

Step up initiatives to improve the long-term retention of faculty through training, development, and mentoring programs, with special attention to underrepresented faculty groups

4

### *Improve Faculty Hiring*

Continue to develop enhanced strategies to assure the successful hiring of a stellar, diverse faculty, including cluster and opportunity hiring

5

### *Improved Climate and Culture for Faculty*

Create better awareness of existing programs that support faculty work/life balance, improve the maintenance of the physical work environment, and create opportunities and space for faculty interaction across the campus

# Infrastructure and Resources Priorities

- 1** ***Improve Physical Infrastructure*** Increase the amount of space, improve the quality of existing space, and advance campus beautification through engagement with key stakeholders and coordinated Master Plan efforts
- 2** ***Prioritize Information Technology Needs*** Prioritize campus information technology needs to support the strategic deployment of IT resources
- 3** ***Support Implementation of Campus Staff Plan*** Support implementation efforts of the campus staff plan, which is aimed at closing the staff salary gap and improving the work environment of UTK staff
- 4** ***Identify Opportunities for Operational Effectiveness*** Identify opportunities for operational effectiveness to result in process improvement, cost savings, and non-tuition revenue opportunities to ultimately provide resources for re-investment in Top 25 priorities
- 5** ***Develop Resource Model*** Develop and continuously refine a resource model to identify sources of funds to support Top 25 priorities



## Next Steps

The following actions were identified as next steps in Top 25 planning; which include identifying areas for both improved productivity and strategic growth.

- Develop and implement a process for gathering baseline faculty productivity data for all academic units
- Develop an approach to completing discipline-specific benchmarking and identifying strategies for advancement
- Identify strategic areas of growth in Research and Graduate Education

# Faculty Productivity and Benchmarking

Academic Leaders will need to be engaged in next steps related to faculty productivity and advancement opportunities for all academic units.

## Baseline Data

*Consistent for All Academic Units*

### Program Review Changes

*Provost Office (Lead)*

- New annual data collection component; engage faculty in process development
- Defined and consistent program output metrics (Undergraduate, Graduate, Research, Engagement)



### Faculty Productivity

Consistent tracking of faculty accomplishments

Supports faculty rewards and strategic planning initiatives

## Benchmarking

*Discipline-Specific*

### Program Benchmarking

*Academic Leaders*

- Discipline-specific metrics
- Discipline-specific peers



### Benchmarking and Strategic Advancement Plans

Discipline-specific comparison to peers

Opportunity for all programs to advance

# Strategic Advancement Framework

All research units (academic units, multidisciplinary units and research centers) with opportunities for growth should be challenged to identify specific plans for growth, to include resource requirements and intended outcomes.

- Current Situation
  - Existing Assets, Investments, and Capabilities
  - Leverage of Personnel
  - Environmental Profile
- Peer Benchmarking
  - Comparison on Key Metrics
  - Strategies for Improvement
- Opportunity Assessment for Leading Programs
  - Strengths Relative to Peers
  - External Funding Potential
  - Revenue Potential
  - Multidisciplinary Collaboration
- Advancement Strategies and Investment Needs

**This initiative will need to be sponsored by the Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Research.**



# Strategic Advancement Framework – Illustrative

An evaluation to identify potential areas of distinction should guide future investments in research growth; the following framework could be used for evaluation.

- ***Faculty in Place*** – Joint faculty and cluster hires in place at UTK
- ***Level of Existing Investment*** – Current allocation of Governor's Chairs, Research Centers, financial resources
- ***External Funding Potential*** – Federal, State, Foundation, and other external funding opportunities
- ***External Interest or Priority*** – Current focus of federal agency or other major funding source, societal need, opportunity for external recognition
- ***Multidisciplinary Potential*** – Opportunity for multidisciplinary growth
- ***Partnerships*** – Opportunities to partner with industry, government, foundations, or NGOs
- ***Graduate Student Growth*** – Potential for growth in graduate students, particularly growth in enrollment or new programs for Ph.D. students
- ***Competitive Position*** – UTK's competitive strength in this area, including number and relative strength of competitors
- ***Value of Proposed Outcomes*** - Calculate what can be achieved by becoming an area of distinction and if the outcomes are sustainable



## **IV. Major Investments and Resource Needs**

# Overview

Resources required to support Top 25 action plan priorities were organized into four categories

## ***Major Investments***

- Large-scale investments and resources needed to address existing gaps in faculty, space and financial support; these estimates address current gaps

## ***Program Needs***

- Staff and program-related needs to achieve the goals and intended outcomes identified in individual action plans; details are provided in supporting plans (undergraduate, graduate, research and faculty)

## ***Information Technology Needs***

- The planning process surfaced a significant number of information technology needs; these are captured in supporting plans

## ***Future Needs***

- Several action plans require additional planning to quantify future investment needs; these are listed as “To Be Determined” in supporting plans

**This section provides an overview of Major Investments; additional resource needs (Program Needs, IT Needs and Future Needs) are outlined in the individual plans.**



# Major Investments

The planning process surfaced the following large resource needs to address existing gaps in areas critical to advancement:

- Additional Undergraduate Course Sections
- Salaries
- Graduate Student Financial Support
- Endowed Chairs and Professorships
- Research Facilities
- Instructional Space
- Deferred Maintenance
- Advanced Information Systems

# Major Investments

Action	Description
Add Undergraduate Course Sections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Many undergraduate course sections are operating at or above 95% of registration capacity</li><li>▪ Additional instructional capacity is needed to add sections of these high-demand courses to relieve bottlenecks and support timely graduation</li><li>▪ An estimated \$15 million is needed to address capacity needs for courses operating at or above 85% of registration capacity</li><li>▪ At a minimum, \$6 million is needed to address capacity needs for courses operating at or above 95% of capacity</li></ul>

# Major Investments

Action	Description
Close Faculty Salary Gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Funding is needed to address the faculty salary gap, but further study is required, including an assessment of total compensation</li><li>▪ Despite some financial benefits to living in Knoxville, lack of competitive salary ranges limits UTK's ability to effectively retain existing faculty and attract new talent in a national market</li><li>▪ Faculty have not received pay raises in four years</li><li>▪ The high-level faculty salary gap between UTK and aspirational peers ranges between 18% and 23%</li></ul>
Close Staff Salary Gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Funding is needed to address the staff salary gap, but further study is required, including an assessment of total compensation</li><li>▪ The Top 25 Staff Plan identifies a market gap in UTK staff salaries</li><li>▪ A study conducted in 2006 estimates that this gap was nearly \$30 million, or ~20% below market at the time</li><li>▪ University employees have not received pay raises in four years</li><li>▪ Similar to the faculty salary issue, staff salary gaps constrain UTK's ability to retain exceptional staff and attract new talent</li></ul>

# Major Investments

Action	Description
Add Endowed Chairs and Professorships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ A fundraising campaign is needed to add distinguished professorships and endowed chairs</li><li>▪ Distinguished professorships and endowed chairs present an opportunity to provide recognition and financial incentives to highly-productive faculty through private fundraising</li><li>▪ UTK is low in number of endowed chairs when compared to Top 25 target peers</li><li>▪ An investment in 75 to 100 new professorships and chairs is needed to provide UTK with private resources to support these highly productive faculty</li></ul>

# Major Investments

Action	Description
Increase Graduate Student Financial Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ When compared to peers, UTK offers lower average stipends and has fewer fellowships available to support graduate students</li><li>▪ This impacts UTK's ability to attract high-quality graduate students and grow the number graduate degrees awarded; the quality of graduate students also impacts the rank of individual graduate programs</li><li>▪ The existing gap in graduate stipends is approximately \$3 million when UTK is benchmarked to all Very High Research Institutions (Carnegie Class)</li><li>▪ In addition, to support growth goals, UTK will need to increase the number stipends by approximately 15%, or 350, which will cost between \$5.3 to \$6.1 million</li><li>▪ The gap between UTK and the Top 25 in the number and amount of fellowships awarded is estimated at \$0.6 and \$1.9 million</li></ul>



# Major Investments

Action	Description
Add New Research Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ New and renovation of current space will be needed to address the current deficit in research facilities, as well as to support future growth in research activity</li><li>▪ Given the current research volume, the deficit in research space according to the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (“THEC”) is over 300,000 Gross Square Feet (GSF)</li><li>▪ In addition to closing the current THEC gap, facilities will need to scale accordingly as research volume grows</li></ul>
Add New Instructional Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ THEC standards also demonstrate an existing gap of over 560,000 GSF in instructional space, including classrooms and classroom labs</li></ul>
Address Deferred Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The quality and maintenance of existing space is also an issue that will need to be addressed</li><li>▪ UTK has ~\$200 million in deferred maintenance related to large-scale capital projects and an additional ~\$600 million in other deferred maintenance</li></ul>

# Major Investments

Action	Description
Develop Advanced Information Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The quality and use of data available for decision making was a consistent theme throughout the planning process</li><li>▪ The following are illustrative gaps of the needs included in the plans:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– <i>Undergraduate</i>: Integrated student data to support retention and graduation decisions</li><li>– <i>Graduate</i>: Tracking systems to support degree audits and graduate student progress</li><li>– <i>Faculty</i>: Systems to track faculty productivity and progress</li></ul></li><li>▪ Specific needs will be reviewed with OIT to determine the appropriate action, but we anticipate that new investment will be required to support these initiatives</li></ul>



## **V. Sources of Funds**



## Guiding Principles

The plan adopted the following guiding principles to identifying sources of funds for resources needs.

- UTK will pursue near-term implementation of actions that:
  - Are self-funding with full-costs considered
  - Require modest investment
  - Increase operational effectiveness
- Major investment opportunities will be reviewed with the Board to identify potential new sources of funds
- Program-related resource needs will be reviewed internally to determine funding strategy

# Sources of Funds

The following funding strategies have been employed at public universities which have made performance advancements.

Source	Examples
<b>Operational Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Strong focus on operational effectiveness measures to “reinvest” in the academic enterprise</li></ul>
<b>State Flexibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Some universities have received increased flexibility and autonomy from the state as the outlook for appropriations has declined</li><li>▪ This new flexibility is, in some cases, tied to performance goals</li></ul>
<b>Gifts and Endowment Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Development of strategic campaigns to reinforce broad university priorities:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Faculty</li><li>– Students</li><li>– Research</li><li>– Infrastructure</li></ul></li></ul>
<b>Tuition and Fees</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Increases in tuition and fees largely based on market-driven comparison to peers</li><li>▪ Changes to in-state and out-of-state student balance</li></ul>

# Funding Model

The Infrastructure and Resources team developed a strategic approach to funding given the current, resource-constrained environment.

- **Prioritization**


- Focus on information technology and physical infrastructure
- Engage team leaders in a process to prioritize and sequence major resource needs and inform future planning efforts
- Allocate existing resources to address highest priorities

- **Funding Model**

- Funding model to be developed by Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, under the guidance of the Chancellor and Provost
- Development/fundraising strategy to align with key Top 25 actions (for example – need for more endowed chairs and professorships)

- **Continuous Focus on Operational Effectiveness**

- Each plan identified opportunities for increased operational effectiveness within their relevant area of focus
- The Infrastructure and Resources Team will also identify and implement opportunities for cost reduction and non-tuition revenue to supplement resources available for Top 25



## **IV. Implementation and Accountability**



# Overview

The approach to implementation and accountability includes four major components:

## ***Accountability***

- The Top 25 Implementation Team will include five Team Leads and the Top 25 Leader
- Implementation Teams appointed for each area of focus; consistent with planning structure

## ***Reporting***

- The Top 25 Implementation Team will be responsible for regular reporting on progress

## ***Communication***

- Regular communications to campus stakeholder groups will be managed by the Top 25 Leader

## ***Metrics***

- The Top 25 analysis will be updated on an annual basis
- Key metrics included in individual plans will supplement this reporting




# Accountability

Teams responsible for planning will continue to be accountable for action, tracking of results, and continuous planning. The Top 25 Leader will provide coordination.



# Implementation Team Structure

Each implementation team will be organized as follows:



## **Team Leader**

**Leader:** Leads implementation efforts and serves as the team representative on the Infrastructure and Resources group

**Membership:** Each Team Lead determines approach to membership; Top 25 Leader (Mary Albrecht) serves as an ex officio member

**Role:** The team role is to provide feedback, oversight, and executive accountability / progress reporting for implementation

**Meeting Structure** - The group will meet on a monthly basis to review progress on 1 to 2 action plans; rotating agenda to be set by Team Lead

## **Action Teams**

**Appointment:** The Team Lead will appoint action teams to spearhead implementation of action plans; one team assigned per action profile

**Membership:** Individuals with primary responsibilities for an area will be assigned to each action plan, along with a faculty champion (as applicable)

**Role:** Teams will be responsible for : (1) completion of action items, (2) action plan updates, including resource needs, (3) progress reporting to the Implementation Team, and (4) metric reporting

# Progress Reporting Roles

The following roles and responsibilities apply to regular progress reporting:

Role	Reporting Responsibility
Top 25 Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Executive Progress Reports</i> – Report progress to the Chancellor and Provost</li><li>▪ <i>Board-Level Reporting</i> – Assist in developing status reports for the University Board of Trustees, at the request of the Chancellor</li><li>▪ <i>Stakeholder Communications</i> – Develop and disseminate communications on progress appropriate for Deans/ Department Heads and other stakeholders</li></ul>
Team Leads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Team Progress</i> – Implementation Team Leads will report action plan progress in regular meetings with all Implementation Team Leaders (Undergraduate, Graduate, Research, Faculty and Infrastructure/Resources)</li></ul>
Action Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Status Reports</i> – Periodic reports to the Implementation Team at monthly meetings</li><li>▪ <i>Resource Needs</i> – New resource needs will be included in progress reports; related estimates will be completed using a common set of assumptions and tracked in the Plan resource model</li></ul>

# Progress Reporting

The Top 25 Leader will provide the Chancellor and Provost with regular updates on the status of action plans.

## Illustrative Example

INITIATIVE	OBJECTIVE	LEAD	PRIORITY	CURRENT STATUS	MONTHLY PROGRESS	STATUS AT A GLANCE
Summer School	Expand summer school; better utilize capacity to grow enrollment	Academic Affairs	1	ON TRACK	↑	Project manager in place; tracking against plan; no anticipated issues
Transfer Students	Develop bridge program with PSOC	Enrollment Services	1	ON TRACK	↑	Tracking for second summer session
Academic Advising	Add new academic advisors and implement online appointment system	Student Success	2	ON TRACK	↑	X academic advisors hired since January; on-line appointment system in place at X colleges
Tutoring	Establish new tutoring units and expand existing ones	Student Success	2	ON TRACK	↑	Plan for expansion in place
Student Recruitment	Improve overall yield of high-achieving students through targeted programming (West Tennessee and Out-of-State)	Enrollment Services	3	ON TRACK	↑	Yield performance reported
General Education	Revise general education to better align with mission	Academic Affairs	1	PLANNING	↑	General education team report out
Course Availability	Expand sections of high-demand courses	Academic Affairs	1	ON TRACK	↑	List of key tracking courses received from departments
First-Year Seminars/Life of Mind	Expand FY Seminars; improve LOM program	Academic Affairs/ Student Success	3	ON TRACK	↑	LOM funding approved; team working on expansion plan for Fall 2011
Undergraduate Research	Expand research opportunities for UG students through better matching with faculty	Research	4	ON TRACK	↑	Plans in place to launch new portal in Fall 2011
Course Scheduling System	Adopt a system to improve course scheduling	Enrollment Services	Foundational	ON TRACK	↑	Sid completed for course scheduling system
Leadership and Engagement	Adopt new leadership programs for UG students (LeaderShape, alternative spring break)	Student Affairs	3	ON TRACK	↑	New leadership program (LeaderShape) in progress
Transition Programs	Expand (gntr; coordinate student orientation; expand welcome week	Student Affairs	3	ON TRACK	↑	
Peer Mentoring	Expand Minority Achievement Program	Student Affairs	3	PLANNING	↔	
Policy Review	Identify opportunities for policy change to support graduation and retention goals	Academic Affairs/ UG Council	1	PLANNING	↔	
Student Counseling and Safety	Hire new student counselors; add systems to support 904-HELP	Student Affairs	2	PLANNING	↔	
Teaching and Learning Modalities	Alternative modes of course delivery, including online options	Academic Affairs	1	PLANNING	↔	
Service Learning	Expand student opportunities to participate in service learning	Academic Affairs	4	PLANNING	↔	
Undecided Students	Define paths for graduation for undecided students	Academic Affairs	1	PLANNING	↔	
Learning Communities	Develop additional learning communities; better coordinate academic and student life	Student Affairs/ Academic Affairs	3	PLANNING	↔	

University of Tennessee - Confidential      Top 25 Implementation      6/6/2011, page 3

## Executive Progress Dashboard

- Top 25 Leader to review progress dashboards with Chancellor on a regular basis
- Prepared for undergraduate, graduate, research and faculty plans
- Tracks progress on action plans

# Progress Reporting

The Implementation Team Leads and Action Teams will be responsible for tracking progress on action plans.

## Illustrative Example

Undergraduate Action Plan		Date: 8/14/2011			
Initiative	Objective	Lead	Priority	Current Status	Monthly Progress
Transition Programs	Expand Ignite, coordinate student orientation, expand welcome week	Student Affairs	3	ON TRACK	YES

Supervisor On Task: Planning or Progress: Yes/No

Status Summary	
Owner and Team	Melissa Shivers
Status Summary	
Issues to Be Elevated	

Key Milestones		
Description	Target Date	Status
Ignite Expansion		
Orientation		
Welcome Week		

Key Operational Metrics				
Description	Baseline Metrics In Place	Timing	Report Date	Status
Ignite - # of Participants and Retention Rate	Yes	Annual	1-Nov	
Orientation - # of Participants, # of program/leaders with academic affairs student affairs collaboration		Annual	1-Nov	
Welcome Week - # of Participants, survey responses		Annual	1-Nov	

Project Notes and Issues

## Action Plan Tracking Tool

- This illustration is the action plan tracking tool used by the Undergraduate Implementation Team
- The brief report tracks:
  - Ownership
  - Summary of Accomplishments
  - Key Milestones and Target Dates
  - Key Operational Metrics and Reporting Timeframes
  - Changes to the Original Plan

# Communications Strategy

Multiple constituencies have provided feedback at key milestones during the Top 25 planning process. This communication strategy should continue with implementation.

Primary Groups	Primary Modes	Frequency
UTK Executive Team and Academic Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress Updates</li> <li>Top 25 Advisory Board Meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly</li> </ul>
Deans, Department Heads, and Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DDDH Retreat</li> <li>Council of Deans</li> <li>Research Council</li> <li>Associate Deans meetings</li> <li>Faculty Senate meetings</li> <li>Presentation for Deans and Department Heads</li> <li>Website/Email</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Semi-Annually</li> <li>Based on Key Milestones</li> </ul>
Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Area Staff Meetings</li> <li>Website/Email</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on Key Milestones</li> </ul>
Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student Focus Groups</li> <li>Website/Email</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once per Semester</li> <li>Based on Key Milestones</li> </ul>









# Year One Timeline and Milestones

The following work plan illustrates key milestones and activities to support implementation through June 2012.

OBJECTIVE	APR 2011	MAY 2011	JUNE 2011	JULY 2011	AUG 2011	SEPT 2011
COMPLETE DRAFT PLANS						
COMPLETE INITIAL RESOURCE ESTIMATES						
REFRESH EXECUTIVE-LEVEL METRICS						
DEVELOP INTEGRATED TOP 25 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN						
DEVELOP OPERATING METRICS DASHBOARDS						
FINALIZE TRACKING AND ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK						
PREPARE BOARD MATERIALS						
PRESENT TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES			★			
KICK-OFF IMPLEMENTATION FOR ALL TEAMS						
FINALIZE AND EXECUTE COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY						
GATHER CAMPUS FEEDBACK ON PLANS						
DEVELOP TOP 25 FUNDING MODEL						

# Year One Timeline and Milestones

The following work plan illustrates key milestones and activities to support implementation through June 2012.

OBJECTIVE	OCT 2011	NOV 2011	DEC 2011	JAN 2012	FEB 2012	MAR 2012	APR 2012	MAY 2012	JUN 2012
PROJECT MANAGEMENT									
TRACK AND REPORT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS									
PREPARE BOARD MATERIALS									
PRESENT TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES	★				★				★
COMMUNICATIONS PLANNING AND SUPPORT									
GATHER CAMPUS FEEDBACK ON PLANS									
UPDATE TOP 25 FUNDING MODEL									
CONTINUOUS PLAN IMPROVEMENT									



***The journey  
we take  
is just as  
important as  
achieving  
the goal***





# **Appendix A: Top 25 Current Position Summary**

# Overview

The “Current Position Summary” provides an executive-level, data-driven comparison between UTK and Top 25 peers across key dimensions of strategic importance.

- **Areas of Focus**

- Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education and Research: Represent interrelated strategic areas of focus for advancement of a public research university
- Faculty and Financial Resources/Infrastructure: Represent broad input categories needed to support Top 25 strategies

- **Metrics**

- Non-overlapping, although at times interrelated, measures that demonstrate important gaps within the areas of focus

- **Comparison**

- Summary-level metrics compare UTK to the “Top 25 Target” Grouping

**This methodology was established in 2010 by the Top 25 Task Force. Rationale and background is documented in the *Executive Summary Report of the Chancellor’s Taskforce* (June 2010).**

# Top 25 Target Peers – One-Year Change

## 2010 vs. 2011 Assessment

Areas of Focus	Metrics	Top 25 Target 2010 Assessment	Top 25 Target 2011 Assessment	Change
Undergraduate Education	ACT Equivalent (75 <sup>th</sup> /25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile)	28.5/23.5	28.4/23.8	-1.1 (High End) +0.3 (Low End)
	Retention Rate (1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year)	90%	91%	+1 pt
	Six-Year Graduation Rate	75%	76%	+1 pt
Graduate Education	Number of Ph.D. Degrees	486	483	-3
	Number of Master's and Professional Degrees	2,130	2,240	+110
Research	Federal Research Expenditures	\$182 M	\$193 M	+\$11 M
	Total Research Expenditures	\$427 M	\$451 M	+\$24 M
Faculty	Avg. Tenure-Line Salary Range	\$73 to \$120 K	\$74 to \$121 K	+\$1 K (Low and High End)
	Undergraduate Students/Tenure-Line Faculty	19	19	No Change
	Faculty Awards	32	35	+3
Infrastructure and Resources	Teaching and Support Expenditures/Student	\$24,300	\$23,710	-\$590
	Endowment/Student	\$38,400	\$42,240	+\$3,840

Sources: UTK institutional data; U.S. News & World Report; The Center for Measuring University Performance; The National Science Foundation; Council for Aid to Education; Institutional Common Data Sets

Notes: (1) Top 25 Target Peer Group consists of Purdue University, University of Minnesota, University of Georgia, Indiana University, Michigan State University, Clemson University, Texas A&M University, Michigan State University

# UTK vs. Top 25 Peers

## Relative Standing Compared to the Top 25 Target – 2011 Assessment

Areas of Focus		UTK	Top 25 Target Group	UTK vs. Top 25 Target Group
Undergraduate Education	ACT Equivalent (75 <sup>th</sup> /25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile)	29/24	28.4/23.8	+6/.2
	Retention Rate (1 <sup>st</sup> to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year)	86%	91%	-5 pts
	Six-Year Graduation Rate	61%	76%	-15 pts
Graduate Education	Number of Ph.D. Degrees	258	483	-225
	Number of Master's and Professional Degrees	1,807	2240	-433
Research	Federal Research Expenditures	\$109 M	\$193 M	-\$83 M
	Total Research Expenditures	\$197 M	\$451 M	-\$254 M
Faculty	Avg. Tenure-Line Salary Range	\$67 to \$109 K	\$74 to \$121 K	-\$7 to \$12
	Undergraduate Student/Tenure-Line Faculty	20	19	+1
	Faculty Awards	11	35	-24
Financial Resources and Infrastructure	Teaching and Support Expenditures/ Student	\$16,300	\$23,710	-\$7,410
	Endowment/ Student	\$16,370	\$42,240	-\$25,870

Sources: UTK institutional data; Institutional Common Data Sets; *U.S. News & World Report*; The National Science Foundation; The Center for Measuring University Performance; Institutional Annual Financial Reports; Council for Aid to Education

# Peers

---

## *Schools by Grouping*

---

### **Top 20 US News Rank (Count – 16)**

University of California – Berkeley  
University of California – Los Angeles  
University of Virginia  
University of Michigan – Ann Arbor  
University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill  
University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign  
University of Wisconsin – Madison  
University of California – Davis  
University of California – Santa Barbara  
University of Washington – Seattle  
Pennsylvania State University  
University of Florida  
University of Texas – Austin  
The Ohio State University  
University of Maryland – College Park  
University of Pittsburgh



### ***Aspiration Group***

---

### **#21 – #30 US News Rank (Count – 8)**

University of Georgia  
Clemson University  
Purdue University  
Texas A&M – College Station  
University of Minnesota  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
Indiana University  
Michigan State University



### ***“Top 25 Target” Group***

---

### **#31 – #39 US News Rank (Count – 3)**

Auburn University  
Iowa State University  
North Carolina State University – Raleigh



### ***Current Peer Group***



## **Appendix B: Supporting Plans**

# Supporting Plans

The priorities summarized in *Section III: Top 25 Action Plan* are supported by plans that contain further contextual information, analysis, and details.

- **Supporting Action Plans**

- Undergraduate Education
- Graduate Education
- Faculty
- Research
- Staff
- Infrastructure and Resources Supplement

- **Structure of Plans**

- Current Situation Analysis
- Closing the Gaps: Strategic Priorities and Actions
- Resource Needs
- Implementation and Next Steps
- Action Plan Profiles

**These plans are available for review upon request. Please contact Top 25 Leader, Mary Albrecht, for additional information.**



# Action Plans

The undergraduate priorities are supported by 24 action plans focused on graduation, retention, student quality and operational effectiveness.

## ***Graduation (15 Action Plans)***

### ***Expect Graduation in Four Years***

Summer School

UTrack and Course Availability

Policy Review

Undecided Students

Transfer Students

General Education

Teaching and Learning Modalities

### ***Provide Adequate Core Student Support***

Academic Advising

Tutoring

One-Stop Student Service

Student Counseling and Safety

### ***Address Changing Student Profile***

Honors Programs

Undergraduate Research

Leadership and Engagement

Study Abroad

Service Learning

## ***First-Year Retention (4 Action Plans)***

### ***Support Transition into the First Year***

Transition Programs

First-Year Seminars/Life of Mind

Peer Mentoring

Learning Communities

## ***Student Quality (2 Action Plans)***

### ***Maintain Incoming Student Quality***

Student Recruitment

Scholarships

## ***Foundation: Operational Effectiveness (2 Action Plans)***

### ***Elevate Quality and Use of Student***

Integrated Undergraduate Student Data

Course Scheduling (Systems and Supports)

# Undergraduate Education – Illustrative Actions

## ***Foundation: Elevate Quality and Use of Student Data***

- ☐ Develop and maintain a tool to integrate different sources of student data to advance analysis and improvement in graduation outcomes
- ☐ Implement a system to improve course scheduling and availability
- ☐ Target new investments based on data indicating student demand

## ***Priority One: Expect Students to Graduate in Four Years***

- ☐ Implement recommendations of the Academic Efficiency and Effectiveness Task Force
- ☐ Grow summer school enrollment to better utilize current capacity; use Summer 2011 as a pilot
- ☐ Develop and implement UTrack, a tool to help students plan and monitor progress toward graduation
- ☐ Add new course sections to increase availability of high-demand courses
- ☐ Implement changes to policies impacting graduation (for example, more restrictive drop policy)
- ☐ Develop a one-stop approach to student support and service
- ☐ Appoint a faculty committee to revise general education requirements
- ☐ Complete articulation tracks to support community college transfers
- ☐ Develop a dual enrollment program with Pellessippi State

# Undergraduate Education – Illustrative Actions

## ***Priority Two: Provide Adequate Core Support***

- ☐ Provide students with a “one-stop” approach to service (a single point of access and customer service for key student transactions)
- ☐ Hire more academic advising, counseling, and tutoring resources
- ☐ Implement operational improvements to improve core support services, including full implementation of on-line scheduling of advising appointments

## ***Priority Three: Support Transition into the First Year***

- ☐ Develop additional learning communities and associated programming
- ☐ Add new first-year seminar sections to meet student demand
- ☐ Add new stipends to support additional undergraduate peer mentors
- ☐ Add sessions to Ignite, a first-year transition program

# Undergraduate Education – Illustrative Actions

## ***Priority Four: Engage Students Based on Changing Profile***

- ☐ Increase grants and scholarships for honors and study abroad programs and hire additional professional staff
- ☐ Implement new leadership and service programs
- ☐ Develop system to better match students to faculty mentors for undergraduate research
- ☐ Develop system to better match students to current opportunities for service learning

## ***Supplemental: Maintain Student Quality***

- ☐ Formalize funding for program to improve yield of high-achieving students

# Graduate Education – Action Plans

Graduate priorities are supported by 12 dedicated action plans. Future growth in degree offerings is inter-related with additional action plans.

## ***Student Quality and Number (2 Action Plans)***

### ***Improve Graduate Student Admissions and Recruitment***

Graduate Student Recruitment

Diversity

## ***Student Financial Support (3 Action Plans)***

### ***Increase Graduate Student Financial Support***

Graduate Student Stipends and Waivers

Fellowship Support

Graduate Student Benefits

## ***Student Retention and Success (4 Action Plans)***

### ***Expand Services for Graduate Student Engagement and Success***

Advising and Mentoring

Student Professional Development and Engagement

Graduate Student Experience

Joint/Dual Degree Programs

## ***Foundation: Operational Effectiveness (3 Action Plans)***

### ***Elevate Quality and Use of Student Data***

Integrated Graduate Student Data

### ***Process Improvement***

Graduate Admissions

Graduate School Website

## ***Inter-Related Action Plans***

### ***Maximize Degree Offerings through Academic Collaboration***

Multidisciplinary Programs – Research

Strategic Areas of Growth – Next Steps

Faculty Productivity – Next Steps/Faculty Plan

# Graduate Education – Illustrative Actions

## ***Foundation: Elevate Quality and Use of Graduate Student Data***

- ☐ Implement a tool for tracking graduate student data, including data related to graduate student retention, success and placement
- ☐ Implement a tool that enables use of technology for graduate student degree audit

## ***Priority One: Increase Graduate Student Financial Support***

- ☐ Increase the number and amount of graduate student stipends and fellowships
- ☐ Evaluate current use and allocation of graduate student assistantships, including associated stipends and waivers
- ☐ Review opportunities for alternative tuition and fee waiver models
- ☐ Identify and communicate opportunities for external fellowships and awards to support graduate student study

# Graduate Education – Illustrative Actions

## ***Priority Two: Improve Graduate Student Admissions and Recruitment***

- ☐ Provide a resource for graduate departments/programs to support recruitment efforts, including new graduate visitation and feeder school programs
- ☐ Streamline the graduate admissions and application process and improve use of related technology
- ☐ Develop a Graduate School brand and web strategy

## ***Priority Three: Expand Services for Graduate Student Engagement and Success***

- ☐ Establish and communicate clear guidelines and processes for advising and mentoring and provide graduate student advising and mentoring training for faculty
- ☐ Develop additional graduate student academic and professional workshops
- ☐ Establish method of assessment of the graduate student experience

## ***Priority Four: Maximize Degree Offerings Through Academic Collaboration***

- ☐ Assist departments in developing new interdisciplinary programs and certifications
- ☐ Increase visibility and number of degree partnerships with other universities, both domestic and international

# Research – Action Plans

Research priorities are supported by 12 dedicated action plans. Research strategies and faculty productivity are inter-related with additional plans.

## ***Research Support (4 Action Plans)***

### ***Enhance and Expand Research Services***

Research Services

### ***Improve Research Communication and Engagement***

Communications

Government Relations

### ***Intellectual Property and Economic Growth***

IP and Innovation

## ***Operational Effectiveness (3 Action Plans)***

### ***Policies and Practices to Enhance Research Success***

F&A Distribution

Administrative Efficiency

### ***Research Recognition and Rewards***

Research Incentives

## ***Research Growth (2 Action Plans)***

### ***Policies and Practices to Enhance Research Growth***

Partnerships

Multidisciplinary Research

## ***Foundation: Research Strategies and Supporting Infrastructure (3 Action Plans)***

### ***Infrastructure***

Core Facilities

Research Space

Research Technology

## ***Inter-Related Action Plans***

### ***Research Strategies***

Strategic Areas of Growth – Next Steps

### ***Research Recognition and Rewards***

Faculty Productivity - Next Steps/Faculty Plan



# Research – Illustrative Actions

## ***Foundation: Research Strategies and Supporting Infrastructure***

- ☐ Develop a strategic advancement framework and identify areas of distinction and opportunity
- ☐ Construct, expand, and renovate research facilities across campus in concert with the Master Plan
- ☐ Identify and establish core facilities and operational standards necessary for strategic advancement
- ☐ Improve and expand research enterprise software support, institutional data collection for decision making and advanced IT services

## ***Priority One: Research Services***

- ☐ Provide additional support services to faculty for proposal success
- ☐ Provide compliance support for new and expanded compliance requirements
- ☐ Modify existing University support services to explicitly support increasing research

# Research – Illustrative Actions

## ***Priority Two: Policies and Practices to Enhance Research Growth and Success***

- ☐ Revise faculty and academic program review criteria and metrics
- ☐ Strengthen multidisciplinary research through distribution of institutional resources and targeted faculty hiring
- ☐ Create and expand strategic partnerships that will lead to shared personnel, facilities and resources
- ☐ Streamline administrative policies related to equipment purchases, research related hiring, and collaborations with ORNL, Y-12 and other partners
- ☐ Optimize allocation of Research Incentive Funds
- ☐ Establish a link between research funding and research services

## ***Priority Three: Research Recognition and Rewards***

- ☐ Implement the newly developed “Faculty Research Incentive Plan”
- ☐ Expand Chancellor’s Awards for research (e.g. Multidisciplinary Research Award)

# Research – Illustrative Actions

## ***Priority Four: Research Communication and Engagement***

- ☐ Improve research communications with our stakeholders to inform about the value and successes of our research
- ☐ Develop practices to connect researchers with advocacy efforts
- ☐ Develop practices to improve researcher knowledge of government relations

## ***Priority Five: Intellectual Property and Economic Growth***

- ☐ Identify and adopt best practices for patent application and licensing
- ☐ Promote technology transfer and business incubation to facilitate economic growth
- ☐ Encourage entrepreneurship and innovation through close ties between the UT Research Foundation, Office of Research and the Anderson Center

# Faculty – Action Plans

Faculty priorities are supported by 8 dedicated action plans.

---

***Faculty Hiring (1 Action Plans)***

---

***Enhance and Expand Research Services***

---

Faculty Hiring

---

---

***Faculty Develop and Support (4 Action Plans)***

---

***Policies and Practices to Enhance Research Success***

---

Faculty Salary

---

Endowed Chairs and Professorships

---

Faculty Productivity

---

Training, Development and Mentoring

---

---

***Faculty Satisfaction (3 Action Plans)***

---

***Policies and Practices to Enhance Research Growth***

---

Rewards and Incentives

---

Benefits

---

Campus Climate

---

# Faculty – Illustrative Actions

## ***Foundation: Elevate Quality and Use of Faculty Data***

- ☐ Establish a core set of faculty productivity metrics for the campus and begin gathering the data during the annual faculty evaluation process
- ☐ Create a database to support the use and reporting of faculty productivity data to external constituents as well as internal administrators and decision makers
- ☐ Benchmark all academic units on core metrics against our Top 25 peers

## ***Priority One: Close Salary Gap with Top 25 Peers***

- ☐ Create and implement a short and long-term strategy to close the salary gap with peers for both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty
- ☐ Implement a development strategy to aggressively solicit additional private funds to supplement state base pay (e.g. professorships and chairs)

## ***Priority Two: Enable Faculty Productivity***

- ☐ Use faculty productivity measures as one important indicator of merit increases and internal awards
- ☐ Work with the Office of Research to create strategies and support services for faculty pursuing external awards
- ☐ Increase the number of national and international external awards received by UTK faculty

# Faculty – Illustrative Actions

## ***Priority Three: Focus on Faculty Retention***

- ☐ Develop more user-friendly resources to support faculty members training and success
- ☐ Create on-line and interactive sites to link together faculty resources in teaching and research
- ☐ Develop campus-wide mentoring structures to address specific needs such as under-represented faculty groups
- ☐ Continue to work with Commissions and other groups on campus to promote faculty benefits and work-life balance initiatives

## ***Priority Four: Improve Faculty Hiring***

- ☐ Work with HR to automate the faculty hiring process
- ☐ Continue to develop strategies to improve diversity hiring efforts, including cluster hires, opportunity hires, a Future Faculty Program and dual career hires
- ☐ Work with the Office of Research, Development and CFO to improve funding for start-up costs

## ***Priority Five: Improved Climate and Culture for Faculty***

- ☐ Continue to measure and monitor faculty climate attitudes
- ☐ Create appropriate and welcoming space on campus to facilitate faculty interaction across disciplines
- ☐ Create better venues to involve faculty across campus in presentations to showcase faculty creativity and scholarships and create better cross-campus dialogues

# Infrastructure and Resources – Continuous Actions

The Infrastructure and Resources Implementation Team reviews undergraduate, graduate, research and faculty priorities to inform the following initiatives:

## ***Physical Infrastructure***

- ☐ Master Plan
- ☐ Facilities Services and Campus Beautification

## ***Information Technology***

- ☐ Top 25 IT Priorities

## ***Operational Effectiveness***

- ☐ Academic and Administrative Operational Effectiveness
- ☐ Cost Saving sand Non-Tuition Revenue Initiatives

## ***Staff***

- ☐ Implementation of Staff Plan

# Staff – Action Plans

Staff priorities are supported by 8 dedicated action plans.

## ***Recruitment and Retention (3 Action Plans)***

Compensation

Incentives

Career Paths

## ***Professional Development and Training (3 Action Plans)***

New Employee Orientation

Supervisor Development

Continued Development

## ***Communications (2 Action Plans)***

Culture of Transparency and Dialogue

Create a hospitable environment



# Staff – Illustrative Actions

## ***Priority One: Recruit and Retain Staff***

- ☐ Work towards improving compensation scales by conducting regular market analyses and implementing findings
- ☐ Develop and implement an incentive plan to reward continuous improvement of job skills and education
- ☐ Develop and implement a program that allows units to provide flexible work schedule
- ☐ Develop and implement career paths within job families that encourages excellence within units

## ***Priority Two: Communications***

- ☐ Develop an environment that appreciates and welcomes diversity
- ☐ Improve information flow throughout the organization

## ***Priority Three: Professional Development and Training***

- ☐ Provide new employee orientation that prepares each employee for his/her responsibilities
- ☐ Provide supervisors the training needed to effectively lead units, and manage and evaluate employees
- ☐ Ensures employees are made aware of and provided opportunities to continue to develop skills